

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,559	12/29/2003	Justin K. Brask	P18244	9088
7590 02/10/2006		EXAMINER		
Michael A. Bernadicou			LE, THAO X	
•	KOLOFF, TAYLOR & 2	ZAFMAN LLP	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Seventh Floor			ARTONII	PAPER NUMBER
12400 Wilshire			2814	
Los Angeles, C	A 90025		DATE MAILED: 02/10/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			H.		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	,		
	10/748,559	BRASK ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Thao X. Le	2814			
The MAILING DATE of this communicated for Reply	ation appears on the cover sh	eet with the correspondence add	tress		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of the period for reply specified above, the maximum statused in the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statused in the period for reply within the set or extended p	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, lication. days, a reply within the statutory minimun tory period will apply and will expire SIX (II, by statute, cause the application to bec	may a reply be timely filed n of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this concome ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	on 26 January 2006.				
)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition fo	r allowance except for forma	I matters, prosecution as to the	merits is		
closed in accordance with the practice	e under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 193	5 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 13-16 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 13-16 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the specific statement of	a) accepted or b) objector on to the drawing(s) be held in a ne correction is required if the dr	abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). awing(s) is objected to. See 37 CF			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4)	rview Summary (PTO-413)			
2) Notice of Neterletices Cited (170-032) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTC-1449 or Preper No(s)/Mail Date	O-948) Pap	er No(s)/Mail Date ice of Informal Patent Application (PTO	-152)		

Application/Control Number: 10/748,559 Page 2

Art Unit: 2814

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

1. The indicated allowability of claim13-16 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to US 2005/0139928 to Kavalieros et al. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ

619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 13-16 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim1-13 of copending Application No. 10/748,383 (US Pub 2005/0139928 to Kavalieros) in view of US 6835639 to Rotondaro et al. Claims 1-13 of the co-pending application claimed essentially the same method of making a CMOS transistor in the claims 13-16 of the instant application.

But, the co-pending application does not expressly disclose converting the p-type polysilicon layer to a silicide to generate a silicide PMOS gate electrode.

However, Rotondaro discloses the method converting substantially all of the PMOS polysilicon layer (si), column 3 lines 6 and 59, fig. 2, to a silicide, column 3 line 26, fig. 7. At the time the invention was made; it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the PMOS silicide gate teaching of Rotondaro with the co-pending application's method, because it would have created a CMOS having PMOS gate electrode with different work function as taught by Rotondaro, see abstract.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 13-16 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thao X. Le whose telephone number is (571) 272-1708. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael M. Fahmy can be reached on (571) 272 -1705. The

Application/Control Number: 10/748,559 Page 5

Art Unit: 2814

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thao X. Le

06 Feb. 2006